

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/532,395

Applicant(s)

GREGORY F. WARD

Examiner

Christopher C Pratt

Art Unit

1771

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Christopher C Pratt.

(3) _____.

(2) Gregory Ward.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 29 July 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All generally.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hassenboehler, Jr. et al (5244482).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

The Examiner suggested amending the claims to reduce the claimed strain rate to a maximum of 6 to overcome '482's min. strain rate of 10. Applicant's declaration shows unexpected results w/ lower strain rates. Applicant also argued pointed out that the instant invention has improved ~~strain rates~~ tensile strength over w/ lower strain rates. The examiner suggested quantifying this property and putting it into the claim. Applicant agreed to remove language which was previously rejected as in over 1/2.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/532,395	GREGORY F. WARD	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher C Pratt	1771	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Christopher C Pratt. (3)_____.

(2) Gregory Ward. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 29 July 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All generally.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hassenboehler, Jr. et al (5244482).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required